

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are currently pending in the subject application, and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-24 are rejected. Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 13-14, 16, 19 and 22-24 have been amended. Claims 7 and 15 have been cancelled. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

**I. Rejection of Claims 10, 11 and 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 10, 11 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 10 has been amended to overcome the rejection of claims 10 and 11. Claim 15 has been cancelled. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**II. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12-17, and 19-24 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12-17, and 19-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,148,261 to Obradovich, et al. ("Obradovich"). Claims 1, 8, 13, 14, 19, and 22 have been amended to clarify the differences between the present application and the cited art. Claims 2-6 have been amended to correspond to amended claim 1. Claim 16 has been amended to depend from claim 13. Claims 23 and 24 have been amended to depend from claim 19. Claims 7 and 15 have been cancelled. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a communications module that is operative to interface with a handheld computing device such that the module can be connected to and removed from the handheld computing device without substantial invasion of the handheld computing device. The system recited in claim 1 differs from the art cited by the Examiner in its modular design. The L-band transceiver and the GPS location system comprise an external

communications module that is designed to interact with commercial handheld computing devices to allow for communication between multiple devices. The modularity of the communications equipment allows damaged or obsolete computing devices to be replaced without the added expense of replacing the communications module, or conversely, allows damaged communications modules to be replaced without disturbing the inner circuitry of the handheld computing device. The Obradovich system does not possess this capability. It is respectfully submitted that Obradovich does not teach a system in which a communication module can be operatively connected to and detached from a handheld computing system in this manner.

Further, Obradovich does not teach a conductive enclosure that substantially encloses an L-band transmitter to facilitate the dispersion of heat and to shield the transceiver from electromagnetic interference. U.S. Patent No. 6,640,084 to Pande et al. ("Pande") was cited in rejecting claim 7. Pande teaches the use of a heat sink with a portable transmission device, but there is no teaching or suggestion in Pande of utilizing a heat sink that substantially encloses an L-band transmitter as to redirect heat from the transmitter and shield the transceiver from electromagnetic interference. The heat sink in Pande is planar, and thus can not substantially encompass any transceiver components. The claimed system is advantageous because L-band transmitters produce a significant amount of heat and are sensitive to electromagnetic interference. The conductive enclosure thus serves a dual purpose, reducing the bulk and complexity of the communications module. It is respectfully submitted that Obradovich and Pande, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a conductive enclosure as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 8, as amended, also recites a conductive enclosure that substantially encloses an L-band transmitter to facilitate the dispersion of heat and to shield the transceiver from electromagnetic interference. It is respectfully submitted, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 1 that Obradovich and Pande, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a conductive enclosure as recited in claim 8. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

It is also submitted that claim 13, as amended, defines patentable invention over Obradovich. Obradovich teaches communication with a third party, but there is no teaching or suggestion that messages in Obradovich can be addressed to a logical network comprising a plurality of personal digital assistants that can be addressed as a single unit, as recited in claim 13. The Examiner cites Fig. 5(c) in support of the rejection, but it is respectfully submitted that Fig. 5(c) only teaches that the handheld device can communicate with another handheld device. There is no teaching that the device can address a logical network, comprising a plurality of personal digital assistants, as a single unit, as recited in claim 13. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 13 is allowable over Obradovich, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn.

It is further submitted that claim 17 defines patentable invention over Obradovich. Claim 17 recites a method of adapting a personal digital assistant to operate in conjunction with a transceiver module having a predetermined form factor. Obradovich teaches an integrated system, with GPS tracking built into a handheld device. There is no teaching or suggestion of adapting a personal digital assistant to operate in conjunction with an existing transceiver module having a predetermined form factor. Further, there is no teaching of adapting the received programmable logic signals and operating voltage according to the predetermined form factor of the transceiver, as there is no teaching in Obradovich of a transceiver module having a predetermined form factor. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 17 defines patentable invention over Obradovich, and the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 is requested.

It is also submitted that claim 19, as amended, defines patentable invention over Obradovich. Claim 19, as amended, recites means for controlling the power consumption of the personal digital assistant, such that the means for determining the location of the personal digital assistant remains in a stand-by mode for a first predetermined interval between updates to the position of the personal digital assistant, and the means for transmitting remains in a stand-by mode for a second predetermined interval between transmissions of the determined location to the at least one other personal digital assistant. The Office Action cites the operating systems of Obradovich as providing a general teaching of power management, but it is respectfully

submitted that there is no evidence that the cited operating systems can manage the operation of a means for determining the location of the personal digital assistant and a means for transmitting in the manner recited in claim 19. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 19 is allowable over Obradovich.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 20-24 all depend, directly or indirectly, from one of claims 1, 8, 13, 17, and 19, and are allowable for at least the reasons discussed under their respective base claims, as well as for their own unique elements. In the interest of brevity not all dependent claims will be discussed herein, but it will be appreciated that the omission of a given claim should not be considered a concession of the patentability of the subject matter associated with the claim.

Claim 14 recites wherein displaying the determined location and the received location information comprises displaying the determined location and the received location information as part of a situational awareness map, such the determined location and the received location information are shown relative to their respective locations in an area represented by the situational awareness map. As discussed above, Obradovich deals only with the location of one other personal digital assistant. Further, the Obradovich device does not show the location of the other personal digital assistant on a common map with its own determined location, as recited in claim 14. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 14 defines patentable invention over Obradovich.

For the reasons described above, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-10, 12-14, 16, 17, and 19-24 should be patentable over the cited art. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 3, 6, 7, 11, 12 and 18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Obradovich. Claim 11 depends directly from claim 8. The Examiner's official notice does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Obradovich with respect to claim 8, and therefore does not make obvious claim 8, and claim 11, which depends therefrom.

Claims 3 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich as applied to claims 1,2 and 8, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0177465 to Robinette ("Robinette"). Claims 3 and 12 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 8, respectively. Robinette does not overcome the deficiencies of Obradovich with respect to claims 1 and 8, and therefore, does not make obvious claims 1 and 8, and claims 3 and 12, which depend therefrom.

Claims 6 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich as applied to claims 1 and 17, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0114553 to Lada, et al. ("Lada"). Claims 6 and 8 depend, directly or indirectly from claim 1 and 17, respectively. Lada does not overcome the deficiencies of Obradovich with respect to claims 1 and 17, and therefore, does not make obvious claims 1 and 17, and claims 6 and 18, which depend therefrom.

Claims 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Pande. Claim 7 has been cancelled and Pande has been addressed with respect to amended claim 1.

It is thus respectfully submitted that claims 3, 6, 11, 12 and 18 are allowable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

## VII. Double Patenting

Claims 1 through 24 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 through 25 of copending Application No. 10/634,295. A terminal disclaimer is provided herewith to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and that the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 6/28/06

  
Christopher P. Harris  
Registration No. 43,660

CUSTOMER No.: 26,294

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL, & TUMMINO L.L.P.  
1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700  
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114  
Phone: (216) 621-2234  
Fax: (216) 621-4072